

## **CRMP Consulting Party Meeting**

Location: Canal Park Lodge, Duluth, MN

Date: 11.21.2013

Time: 9-12am

### Participants

Isle Royale Family and Friends Association (IRFFA):

Missy McDonald (MM), Nancy Ousley (NO), Chris Gale (CG)

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO):

Brian Conway (BC)

North Shore Commercial Fishing Museum (NSCFM):

Don Hammer (DH), Stuart Sivertson (SS)

National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP):

Barbara Pahl (BP) – Via Phone

Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN):

Amanda Reintjes (AR) – Via Phone

National Park Service (NPS):

Phyllis Green (PG), Liz Valencia (LV), Don Stevens (DS),

Facilitator: Tim Cochrane (TC)

Meeting Notes: Seth DePasqual

## **Summary of Principal Points of Discussion**

### Re: Traditionally Associated People (TAP) Determination

IRFFA expressed disappointment with TAP outcome; they feel that determination was flawed and would have preferred a more extensive ethnography. ISRO Staff explained the determination process, how it came to be, what it means in respect to the future, and that further discussion on the matter was still possible.

NPS Follow-Up: If IRFFA would like to put any relevant information they felt was overlooked in the determination they may do so. NPS will convene a conference call to discuss their concerns with subject matter experts and are willing to do so in January or February, 2014. The Park will check on the status of the FOIA so IRFFA can factor that into when they would like to have a separate discussion.

### Re: Common Definitions/Terms for Historic Themes

IRFFA feels that the “recreational” theme to describe “Summer Cabins/Camps/Cottages” theme/descriptor is a bit of a misnomer. Would like to revisit how we (collectively) categorize certain historic themes as they may have bearing on related decision-making.

NPS Comment: No alternative descriptors proposed at this time. Agreed to revisit. To be discussed in depth at a later date.

#### Re: Commercial Harvest of Fish on Isle Royale

A NSCFM representative expressed his frustration regarding laws and policies as they relate to commercial fishing on Isle Royale. He stated his personal interest in the renewal of a commercial harvest (fish) on Isle Royale as the practice is a significant part of island history.

NPS Comment: A desire for commercial versus demonstration fishery can be brought up as options by this group for inclusion as adverse impacts; however Park is not sure how to handle an issue that was decided at the time of Park creation. Whatever recommendations come out of this plan, they could not be implemented without full input from other interested parties including MI DNR, Tribal bands, etc. and a final decision would have to be rendered outside this plan.

#### Re: Treatment of Historic Properties

IRFFA sees value in the connection between physical structures and related historic living cultures. There was also concern about previous loss of structures.

NPS Comment: ISRO Staff explained how this will be addressed in CRMP process.

#### Re: Foundation Document

There was concern that only archaeological and not historic resources were mentioned specifically in Park Purpose, Significance Statement, and Fundamental Resources and Values (FRVs). An opinion was expressed that Historic Structures should be included in FRVs. NPS Staff explained how the Park Purpose and Significance Statements are rooted in enabling legislation language.

NPS Comment: There will be further discussion about how historic structures and related resources might factor into FRVs. Park needs to be more explicit about how enabling legislation language has bearing on Foundation statements.

#### Re: Wilderness Act implications

There was discussion of Wilderness Act at Isle Royale, how it was implemented, how designations were made, what those designations mean, how Wilderness Character statements might factor in, etc. There were questions about "historic use" and how they might factor into discussion about future preservation and use. The National Trust mentioned that a legislative strategy was used at Cumberland Island (National Seashore) to change boundary designations. IRFFA liked this strategy and would like to approach Congress in collaboration with NPS and other consulting parties to revisit Wilderness boundary designations.

NPS Comment: NPS must first evaluate if a Wilderness conflict truly exists, which depends on what is proposed. All parties need to have a "Plan B." The Wilderness bracket must be considered in all proposals.

#### Re: CRMP Alternative Concepts

There were concerns about funding specifics and just how they might factor into separate alternatives. No mention of funding in any alternative concept. Also some discussion about how certain concepts came to be and why some are more resource-specific than others. IRFFA expressed that concepts A, C and D seem to put a lot of historic resources at risk. The NSCFM likes Alt. B best as does IRFFA.

NPS Comment: NPS Staff stated that funding specifics will be discussed as CRMP moves forward and that alternative concepts were developed with attention to certain brackets and priorities in mind.

Re: Other consulting parties and their involvement

There was some question about the role of the ACHP and regional tribal bands. Where are they today and what has been their involvement thus far?

NPS Comment: NPS Staff explained that they have been in communication with both the ACHP and the bands. The ACHP representative had planned to attend today's meeting but later cancelled. Native American groups have requested separate council with the Park, which is possible under their distinction as sovereign governments.

Re: Further consultation as plan moves forward

IRFFA and NSCFM requested more communication with Park during CRMP process. More updates.

Resolution: All parties agreed to more dialogue, ideally every couple of months.

**MEETING COMMENSES**

Note: (Parentheses used primarily for subject clarification)

PG: Introductions. Role definitions.

TC: Facilitator role defined. I won't step on any conversations. Great if we shared floor equally, that's my primary role here. Equity between participants. Two hours seems to be pretty short. Is there a really big thing that is missing in agenda? A major topic? This might mean bumping something.

CG: Ethnographic overview/REAP/TAP decision. I ask because I'm a "non-traditionally associated" individual but also a 4<sup>th</sup> generation of a life-lessee.

DS: We can talk about this early in discussion.

TC: Anyone else?

DH: Agenda OK for me.

SS: I see missing here an interest in the discussion of living cultures on ISRO. Maybe we'll discuss this as noted by CG.

MM: From presentations and draft alternative concept observations I feel some common definitions are useful. Pointed out summer cabins in respect to maritime culture. Wants better definitions.

AR: No issue with agenda

Introductions:

BC: Here in a foreign state as Michigan SHPO.

DS: Regional Historian, Omaha

SS: Boardmember for Tofte Commercial Fishing museum. Descendent of commercial fishermen.

DH: Manages Commercial Fishing Museum.

MM: Boardmember for IRFFA. Married into family (summer cottage).

NO: Boardmember for IRFFA. Married into family (summer cottage).

CG: Boardmember and current president of IRFFA

LV: Chief of Interpretation and Cultural Resources

PG: Superintendent, ISRO

AR: Field rep for NTHP and MHPN.

DS: Going to throw out some numbers with brief overviews. Evaluated structures: 130 historic structures identified. All are listed on Park's list of classified structures (LCS), which is evaluated using NR criteria. There are 213 archaeological sites that have been evaluated. 18 evaluated cultural landscapes, 6 of which have been completed and are now listed on Park's Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI). These have been through SHPO review and concurrence. Some are listed on NR including all four lighthouses, Edisen Fishery, 10 shipwrecks as arch sites, and the Minong Mine. The others have been evaluated and are treated the same as if they were listed. What are they: Tobin Harbor (TH) district, Crystal Cove, Washington & Barnum Island, etc. TH is being evaluated as a waterborne historic landscape.

CG: Says here in Newsletter 2...only a few ethnographic resources have been evaluated. My point is... just who is going to comment on landscapes with no TAPs on them? But you're going to go to outside TAPs to help evaluate them.

DS: We had members of TH contribute to the discussion. Snell for instance.

CG: What about "actions common-to-all." Appears to be no room for comment on those.

PG: There is still room.

CG: In consultation maybe. There is no provision for non-TAPs.

PG: We are talking to many people.

DS: We did talk to TH folks for related district nomination.

CG: It seems that you're not including TH folks in future discussions about Actions-Common-to-All.

PG: We're in consultation now. I know you're concerned about TAP. How much of this time here do you want to spend on this issue? This might be better for a side conversation given that others are in the room now. Explains how TAP process worked: Two opinions on the matter, one more conservative, and one less so. We went with the less conservative opinion. The determination is an administrative decision (internal). We'd prefer to set this matter aside for another meeting.

CG: I think this is part of the discussion.

BC: I look at this from the 106 discussion. ID the resources first, then the plan for the resource, then the impacts on that resource in relation to that plan. Part of the consultation process is looking at whether or not things were left off or not. This consultation is part of the discussion. All of this is related to National Register. From my perspective, this does not impact the things (historic structures) that are eligible for the NR.

MM: It does affect long term preservation of NR buildings because it's difficult to separate preservation from its historic use. At St. Paul, you (NPS) mentioned the specific structures...and for the most part it

featured buildings that we preserve. We think the TAP was wrong. The facts were wrong. We want to talk about it at some point. We have material that we want to present.

PG: We can have a discussion about the TAP decision. But today is not the day.

DS: We need to expand the discussion to include those who were involved in the decision. This would be Stephanie Toothman along with other NPS folks (Mike Evans, Tim Cochrane, Chuck Smyth, etc).

PG: Before the decision was made we approached a DC ethnographer and consulted with a separate ethnographer from outside the region.

MM: Knows that this was done. But we want further discussion on TAP.

DH: Please include me in TAP discussion as well.

TC: I'm going to interject here. There's been no determination on ethnographic resources being eligible or not.

DS: We have more ethnographic work to do. This plan needs to recognize that. It is a big gap. This finishes what I wanted to say earlier. ISRO things have high integrity. You'll see on fishing map that we have lost many fisheries.

CG: Our overarching concern here is that we're not going to be given a proper hearing. Tim Cochrane's review ended with the "one thing in common" statement. I found this offensive. We all love the park. Sure. But I don't believe that backpackers have as much to offer as the people in these families. Feels the TAP minimizes the role of people (associated with families). The language is vindictive. "Summer recreationists", "Wilderness Camps", "Summer homes/cabins/camps", etc....these descriptors devalue our role. The TAP missed this. Do you feel this ethnographic study is adequate?

TC: Need to figure out how much time we're going to spend on this matter.

NO: I think we need to spend some time on what should be covered today.

DS: As Brian said, we need to work with items on the NR or things that could be affected by actions. As we move further here, we should be discussing potential impacts. The park boundary is a good place to start. The first step is the resource identification of historic properties, then looking at the proposed concepts, then offering what we think of those alternatives and what they might impact. Today we're introducing these concepts and want to know what you think about them.

CG: Agree...but I question my role if we've been placed in this non-traditional being.

PG: You have a role here despite this determination. We can explore that subject more later. I know you're coming in frustrated. But this is where we're at. This consultation is part of a framework. You're here in a consulting process now. This is a good thing as we're in a formative stage.

DS: On the question of being marginalized with regard to future discussions, I do not view it this way. The role you're now playing is not a one shot deal. You can continue to be part of the consulting party process. As this plans moves forward, you're interests as they relate to Isle Royale doesn't end at the close of this plan. You will be involved afterwards as we implement the plan.

MM: Put yourself in my shoes. We've had no significant conversation in 3 years. We do not ID historic structures in common categories. Maritime also includes use of boats, recreational fishing, vernacular boats, etc. We're in this box that doesn't seem to work. There is an absence of baseline data.

DS: Well we're having that discussion now

CG: The newsletter reinforces our concern. Frustration exists because we don't know where we fit. Then there's 8 month old FOIA request. No baseline info from that request to inform our thinking. We think it's time to talk to the ACHP.

PG: Now is the time to talk to us. You can supply input to us as an individual and also as IRFFA. If you feel that sitting in a particular box is going to help us, then we're listening. We're going to stay crisp on the process. You have issue with an administrative decision (TAP) and we'll work to figure it out with you (FOIA request). I'm willing to have a dialogue with or without the FOIA information. We can reconvene after the request is completed.

CG: If the NPS followed their own laws and policies we'd have no concerns. Seems to be a ton of language suggesting that things WILL happen, SHALL happen, etc. We didn't see this happen. But what DID happen was the TAP. The determination seemed to drop out of nowhere.

DS: Missy and Larry Edwards approached me at the Listening session in MSP (November, 2010) regarding this sort of research. They showed me information/language specified in DO-28. On the trip north to Duluth we talked to the regional ethnographer Mike Evans. Mike suggested starting it himself. So it started there, and then eventually Tim got involved.

MM: MM: We (Missy and Larry) were asking for a REAP as a starting point, not a TAP. If you read my written comments submitted in December 2010 during the last public comment period you will see that I quote NPS-28 guidelines that require various ethnographic assessments and a REAP study to be initiated at the beginning of plan scoping.

DS: You were pointing to TAP language.

MM: My husband was speaking as an individual, not for IRFFA.

PG: The question was raised and we decided to explore it further. We've made this commitment. But how much more do we need to discuss this? We'll push getting the FOIA for you. Not sure where you are in the pile of thirty FOIA requests now at regional office.

NO: Going back to that time, my read of policies was that an ethnographic study was necessary. Such studies should go forward sooner rather than later. It's a "foundational" piece of information.

PG: We have ethnographic resources related to cultures associated with structures. We have some that are not. We're trying to move forward with this plan knowing that more information will always be needed.

DS: We have one (ethnography) for the fisherman.

MM: Sure, but nothing for other folks. And this (fishing ethnography) informed the TAP. The summer cabin folks want something comparable to inform this process. We feel baseline data doesn't exist. We feel our voices are not being heard and our rights are being violated.

BC: For clarification, we're on agenda item Number 2. I hear about what you're saying, but we need to get towards the treatment of historic properties. Do you feel that we are missing anything related to structures?

SS: As I was growing up at Wash. Harbor...there were structures related to the Washington Club. Later on, after commercial fishing went down, I lived at one of the buildings. People enjoyed the building. That building is totally gone now. It should have been on the NR. It was a two-story building in good shape. What happened to it? How does this happen? It concerns me. And also that commercial fishing was halted. My mothers' permit was not transferred to me. I felt this was arbitrary decision made by the Superintendent. Something is wrong with this process, the way historic properties are treated. The revenues that come with commercial fishing were useful. It's hard not having them (revenues) when you need to maintain docks. These are important structures, but they seem to be subject to removal without open discussion.

LV: Certainly this has happened before we had a comprehensive study.

DS: This plan is meant to stop that sort of thing.

CG: To answer Brian, I don't know of any structures that have been missed.

MM: But we also need to consider other historic things, such as culture.

DS: The plan is going to look at other things beyond historic properties. That's why I put that heading in there (the meeting agenda). In the world of 106, the Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are the type of places that fit into NR discussion.

TC: I'd like to summarize the ethnographic situation regarding NR, etc. It hasn't been performed on any user group. No TCP for native groups, fishermen, etc. That has not happened. Further, with regard to archaeology, there's a catch-up that has to occur. When you talk about historic structures, you have 100% survey, but less on other things. But part of the question is priorities. I hear you on your concerns.

MM: We're down to the last 2 life leases.

PG: That's a legal construct that comes to an end. The plan is how we'll go forward. That legal contract needs to be acknowledged. This is an effort to get you to understand why the park exists. Stuart is looking at how rules changed over time. Sometimes more clarity comes with new rules. Sometimes new rules equate to bad decisions when considered in relation newer rules. Even today structures are documented and removed. The intent here (with the CRMP) is to be more thoughtful about where we go. During my tenure I've clearly held onto as much as we could. There are a lot of voices that are not at this table that are silent. The plan needs to keep them in consideration. Tribal groups want more research. This is about dialogue. We may not have the answers that will benefit you most, but we will have a framework for the future. That's we're we are today.

DH: What you just said is what we should have heard at 9am. Remember what you said because it was beautifully said. You did do a good job capturing where we're at.

TC: Can we move to Item 3?

## **10 MIN. BREAK....**

## **...MEETING RESUMES**

Barbara Pahl from NTHP joins conversation

Introductions for Barbara

Item 3: Park Purpose

LV: Want to talk about the draft foundation document, which is something we've been working on for over a year now and something NPS is doing nationwide. This ID's park purpose, significance, fundamental resources and values (FR&V). Much comes out of enabling legislation. The Park Purpose statement is almost exactly the same as noted in GMP with a few minor changes. The Park Significance statement took more time. As we went through past reports we noted things that were not ID'd and

placed them in new Significance Statements. We can spend a few minutes for discussion about what might be missing. Also...certain parks have fundamental resources and we took steps to ID them. The FR&Vs are very broad with little specifics. They came from legislation and policy.

CG: Are these coming from essentially "Day 1", when the Park was established?

LV: Yes. A few come from the Park's enabling legislation, such as research.

BP: Why did you limit CR to archaeology, but no other human history? Especially as they relate to other laws?

LV: We drew from enabling legislation as it was mentioned specifically. This is the legislation that justified foundation of the Park.

DS: Fundamental resources are a bit broader than what was discussed in the enabling legislation.

BP: But you don't call them out. We've had good success recognizing that people were there before the park happened. Wording limited to Native American history.

NO: If this is really a statement that is so bound up in what founding legislation was, then say so. Do this because we were left wondering.

MM: I'd like to reiterate that I am pleased with the Park Purpose statement, that cultural and natural resources were mentioned. I vote to add to Point #8...CR sites and resources.

BP: Also historic properties. Number 7 also.

PG: Editors want to keep this boiled down.

BP: We just had a long conversation with Yosemite where they only highlighted archaeology. They have now added historic stuff.

AR: My impression is that this and CRMP are being developed simultaneously. Agree with Barb's comments.

TC: Are you saying that foundation document needs to be done before CRMP?

AR: Yes. Or I'm just wondering about priority here.

DS: The foundation document will be completed first.

PG: Worth noting that many park are working without them. We are one of first in region to go through this process. Your comments are duly noted.

TC: What about FR&Vs. Additions? Deletions? This is where the group is primarily working. More flexibility in this category. Urge you to review this.

MM: I have laundry list from the IRFFA board. I'd like to back up and say that IRFFA wants it to be broader than historic properties, more comprehensive.

CG: I've seen this language before. I would continue to tout the broader aspect.

SS: The waters around ISRO were significant as sources for fish. During WWII, all fishermen were exempt from draft. Fish were caught and transferred to market. Great Lakes fish commission reestablished fish populations and Isle Royale was a source for stock. There is a long history going back more than 100 years of fish data. Director Conrad Wirth established a policy for commercial fishing on ISRO which provided for a number of fishing locations island-wide. I think we need to continue/preserve these historic activities and related structures.

LV: Under significance, we listed fish and made it broader. Under FR&V's, we included related language. Is this adequate?



SS: When these populations can be harvested, this is beneficial to the nation. This is important for ISRO as this happened in the past. I want to see the harvesting of fish populations.

NO: We looked at Number 2, the “isolation” language. The fact that it is not inhabited for most of the year is unusual. Folks can’t believe that I go to this place every summer. It is amazing that it is so hard to get to and you can only be there for part of the year. If it’s hard for us now, it must have been harder before.

LV: Are you suggesting that isolation doesn’t cover the cultural component.

NO: Yes.

PG: We are capturing your ideas. But regarding commercial fishing, I think you want the recognition that we should carry this over (to restore commercial harvest). If you go through enabling legislation and related dialogue, commercial removal of fish or game is not done in a park unless it’s in the enabling legislation.

SS: Was it illegal this this carried on over all those years?

PG: It carried on. The one right MI retained after ISRO was established was the right to regulate the fisheries. And so we have an entire zone around ISRO as a non-commercial fishery. MI treaty laws require a dialogue with tribes, etc. A lot of that dialogue was put by wayside. Commercial fishing on ISRO occurred (after Park establishment) because it was grandfathered in through previous holders of commercial fishing permits. That permit closes thereafter and is not transferred. You can suggest anything you want. But I want you to know about uphill battles.

SS: Isn’t it proper to promote historic activities? The ISRO closure is not a matter of law; it’s a pronouncement of the DNR that could be changed via legislation. Should we include commercial harvest in the significance statement?

PG: There would be room for assessment fisheries. The continuity (of fishing) was broken when you decided not to do more assessment fisheries.

SS: You told me we could use the buildings as a base for assessment fishery, but to operate (harvest fish) outside the 4.5 mile limit of park. My sister will attest to that.

PG: We’re not remembering the conversation the same. There are two options: assessment fisheries would involve consultation with MI DNR, review of park policies, etc. Same thing goes for demonstrative fisheries. From the context of a commercial fishery, a full blown harvest operation is a very complicated long-term, far-reaching issue. We can consider this sort of thing in the plan...but I want you to know there are gradients here, and that some gradients are harder to implement.

SS: If we say in this plan that it (commercial harvest) is gone forever, then it will never be possible again.

DS: We need to move forward on this conversation.

PG: We can continue this conversation later.

TC: We need to introduce the role of Wilderness in this conversation. With regard to NHPA, I hear you asking if places are historic properties. But what about regarding places like McCormick Reef, could that be a TCP? Brian, have you ever had an animal evaluated as a historic property?

BC: No. There have been evaluations of farming landscapes, related activities and such.

PG: What I’m hinging my comments on is Stuart’s suggestion that commercial fishing should continue when it was mentioned in enabling legislation & following discourse to phase out.

MM: Coming from Board, the first one to add to FR&Vs is “Spiritual.” Want to see more history added that’s tied to historic use. When we say maritime character and culture, we should not limit it to fisheries, shipwrecks, lighthouses, etc. We think summer camps are also tied to this. Also air quality, dark skies, roadless qualities, soundscapes, conservation ethic, cultural community, wilderness ethic.

TC: Good...back to fundamental resources or should we move on? Is anyone going to bring up how Wilderness roles into this?

LV: We mentioned this in presentation mostly as an overview. Most of the maps show this. The majority of the park is Wilderness. Small portions are Non-wilderness. Real interesting and a critical part of this plan are the areas of Potential Wilderness Additions (PWAs). This is where a large majority of CR landscapes/structures are located. We’ve been talking a lot about what is appropriate and how to move forward with discussions about preservation here. We seem to be on the cutting edge related to this issue.

BP: What percentage is designated wilderness?

LV: 99% is Wilderness.

BP: Are you suggesting that 100% be Wilderness?

PG: Congress said that when non-conforming uses are done (i.e. life-leases, fire tower observations, unnecessary administrative uses, utility cables, etc.), the PWAs automatically convert to Wilderness. It is not a discretionary matter. But the discretion is timing. It relates to tools, maintenance costs, what’s allowable in Wilderness, what’s not. Regarding fire towers, they were included in Wilderness as an Administrative Use that was OK until that use changed. In recent court cases about fire towers, Wilderness groups want them out/removed. Compromises have been made, sideboards defined as they relate to Wilderness, etc. If you try to pin me down on what we do here or there, that’s what the plan is about. We’ll get pushback depending on what direction we go.

BP: At Cumberland Island we had to change the law. Is that what we might do here?

PG: The question is whether we need to do it or not? It all depends on what we propose to do at these locations. Certainly if you’re on the higher end of use, visitation, etc., then it would push you towards this request. But if you don’t foresee much conflict with Wilderness, then maybe it’s not necessary. The rationale needs to be extremely well thought out.

CG: Where in this does it mandate historical use?

TC: I’m going to take my facilitator hat off. If you’re familiar with the Cumberland Island situation, a judge attempted to define historic use, but the rendering refers to a passage of time rather than any historical thing we would identify with. This happens in Olympic and another place. Historical value is a concept that is bouncing around in courts right now.

CG: What do you mean by passage of time?

TC: It has nothing to do with human construct, but just a passing of a long time.

DS: There is a WBMP that is on hold now as this plan moves forward. There is intent that they will synchronize. At this point, we’re reviewing the 5<sup>th</sup> value (i.e. “other”) in respect to ISRO resources. Not much push back from Region at this point. But this is still being explored and refined.

TC: Is there a time table when the Wilderness Character is drafted and available for review?

PG: We’re working on it in December. You can get bogged down on multiple interpretations, but the important thing to get at here is why certain features might be important. Knowing that we all value the

setting it (historic resource/theme) is in, which is mostly natural, how do we make a complimentary decision that is good for all resources? That is the trick. But it needs to stand on the merits of the policies involved. All adverse impacts need to be part of the dialogue. This includes Wilderness.

CG: I hear your frustration. But we're not privy to any of the discussions that have happened internally. Tim has answered my question.

BC: I'm unclear about how decisions about PWA and Wilderness were made.

PG: Congress determined this during passage of Act. Non-wilderness was determined to always stay out. PWA was determined to roll over at a certain time (i.e. sunset of life-leases, no longer necessary administrative uses, etc.). These reflect decisions made in 1976. What we have is an overlay that created a bit of chaos (PWA designations in areas where preservation options are now being discussed).

TC: Getting close to end of time. Can we stay longer?

BP: I need to leave.

TC: Let's go till noon. Sorry some of you have to leave (Barbara Paul), but we should take advantage of our time here and continue. Let's move on to alternatives. Let's have a quick synopsis.

LV: There's the No Action Alternative. I don't think we need to spend too much time there. What about Alternative A?

SS: If lack of funding leads us to non-conforming use, does that mean it's out of question? All of these alternatives have budgetary implications. If a plan is developed that can't be funded, then where are we?

DS: Budgetary reality check will occur later on in process. We will cost these out once we have a better idea of what is proposed.

BP: Doesn't have newsletter. Are you aware of the leasing study that NTHP recently passed?

DS: Yes, we've had a solicitor opinion that covers some of this, but it also recognizes constraints (i.e. Wilderness).

PG: Stuart, I know why you had that context on commercial fishing (renewing commercial harvest). I told you that if you wanted a commercial fishing permit, you should go to DNR and apply to fish outside of Park boundary using the Sivertson fishery as a base of operation because Park policy does not permit it nor would we change it without this CRMP plan & after consultation with tribal bands and the State.

TC: You guys need to cover this later.

LV: Any other thoughts on Alt. A?

NO: Obviously this would have a tremendous impact on CR.

MM: For Barbara's sake, should we quickly cover alternatives and get her comment?

DS: Yes.

LV: Reviews alternative concepts for Barbara.

BP: Regarding Alternative A, are there properties outside of Wilderness?

AR: I'm looking at alternatives A, C and D. Now wondering how Alt. B came to be while others have specific focus.

DS: We felt we had resources on ISRO that had high degrees of integrity covering a sweep of themes. They are an impressive resource of their types, which is largely due to isolation. Alternative B

recognized the importance of the related resources and called for partnerships to save as much as possible.

AR: Sounds like Alternatives C and D are more focused and possibly more financially feasible.

PG: The alternatives were put out to allow folks to think of these resources separately. There is still time for more discussion. One alternative was built around maritime. The alternatives are conceptual things intended to get people thinking and offer ideas. They are a framework for dialogue.

BP: So comments are needed by Dec. 4<sup>th</sup>?

DS: Yes.

BARBARA LEAVES

CG: IRFFA's stand is that Alternative B is best, but that parts of each are really good. If NPS is willing to think out of the box, then much of it (alternative-wide) is possible.

TC: Put them together (alternatives) and tell us what you think is right.

NO: From the lens of historic properties, alternatives A, C and D put a lot of resources at risk. This is one thing that needs to be clear in the alternatives.

MM: If you read the NTHP report on historic leasing, they stress the danger of preservation efforts using only one lens (i.e. one concept only). This is not favorable for structures.

DH: Would one of the members of NPS take me through a partnership example? How would you share oversight? Say my organization decided to take on the preservation of Sivertson fishery.

PG: We have lots of tools such as VIPs, Partnerships, Historic Leasing, etc. But what's important is the framework. What's important is public benefit. What is your capacity to do the work proposed? There are multiple people/groups that might want to take advantage of these opportunities. We have people who see family VIPs and want something similar. Examine the tools and submit a framework. There would be commitments, and also accountability.

DH: I see everyone at Tobin Harbor applying for Partnerships for each cabin.

PG: You can't fundraise for NPS buildings without permission. A fund raising campaign needs to be vetted through NPS along with the funders themselves.

DH: Sees that a partnership would be unlikely if we can't raise funds.

PG: Fund raising is possible within a partnership.

DH: But if I took on the Sivertson project, I suspect funding would pour in.

PG: This is OK provided we get that partnership agreement together.

DH: Then I like Alternative B. It's a viable process in that Partnerships would ultimately last longer than people.

CG: But use is a serious question.

TC: So we see that Partnerships are promoted in Alternative B.

MM: Is everything allowable in Wilderness such as in Alternative C demonstrative fishing or canoe building or...?

DS: High-use activities work best in Non-wilderness such as Barnum and Washington islands.

MM: Is everything proposed (in alternative concepts) doable in Wilderness, or Non-wilderness?

PG: Yes, but only doable in context with Wilderness boundaries and proposed uses. All weighed for impacts to either Cultural Resources or Wilderness. Do give note to the boundaries.

MM: Does the NPS recognize the value of ancestral kinship ties? Our camps for example? We like the Cape Code (CACO) model, because when they (consulting parties / advisory council / NPS) came to table, the plan valued to preserve relationships with the people involved. [Describes briefly how this model came to be.]

NO: We like the idea of not reinventing the wheel, i.e. CACO model.

MM: [Describes CACO model where certain percentages of dune shacks were allotted via partnerships to family groups, public groups, etc.]

PG: Lost track of current status at CACO and how/if this plan was implemented. There were proposals, but I'm not sure if they were implemented. People can propose a lot, but when finally implemented, that's when the rubber hits the road.

CG: I believe it was implemented, but with a few recognized problems.

DS: The immediate challenge on Isle Royale is the Wilderness setting and how the public might interface with the arrangement.

MM: They (Cape Code planning group) valued solitude, privacy, spirituality...and they do so by also recognizing the value of historic long-term ties. The public can still pass through (family camp vicinities), but they don't have to be physically present on site to experience and understand it's value.

PG: As you move the justification forward, keep in mind that the Wilderness bracket is significant. CACO did not have to abide by Wilderness standards.

MM: The footprint (historic) is light. We should go to Congress and work together. We could save a lot of cultural resources in Wilderness. It's only .5% percent of the island. I stand by the 35 pages we submitted a year ago.

NO: What are the chances that we approach this (revisit Wilderness designations) in the alternatives?

PG: You shouldn't approach Congress on your own.

MM: Of course not, we want NPS at the front.

PG: Submit this again if you feel this is necessary.

MM: We will. We wrote this because we felt there was no dialogue between IRFFA and the NPS.

BC: Might want to approach this within one of the Alternatives.

NO: We bump up against this problem in every alternative.

PG: The NEPA process has a category where things are proposed, but not further considered. But I'm telling you here that you need a good Plan B. Don't put all your eggs in one basket. We all know how Congress works these days.

TC: Trying to get us back on track here. We expect you to go home and digest and think about this all. Other thoughts?

NO: Spent most of career in State government planning efforts, etc. I see how preferred alternatives are selected. I want to keep ideas about use on the table. I want to make another overarching statement, which is: the thing about these properties, the histories, the generations, the ethnographic study, they are still important as they inform so much about the properties. No one goes there in the winter. It's not a year round place. I have trouble with the summer recreational camp descriptor. I know in Missy's family that when those people started spending time there, they didn't stop their work.

There were writers, church leaders, so it's just like any other community. There were different occupations that were pursued. It's a seasonal place because no one spends their whole time there. The community is unique and amazing. That's why we're jacked up about the TAP decision because it takes out a part of this community. These folks never would have communicated with one another had they not come to the island. It's amazing that these relationships have continued over generations. Please keep this in mind as plan develops. Ethnographies can do a lot to enrich the planning effort.

TC: It seems like where somewhat exhausted here. Should we continue with further consulting during the process?

DS: We are now in a formalized NEPA process. At minimum, what we will do is review comments and move further to detail the alternatives. The drafting of the plan will move into next fall/winter. Then there will be more opportunity to comment. But this is the minimum. Should we communicate more? How? Will that be helpful? I'm not sure how much we'll have to share at certain points. Would conference calls be helpful? I'm thinking about the next year here.

TC: Frequency of communication is the issue.

PG: Normally a bit of a black box, but it doesn't always have to be. But when you open it, everyone needs to be there. I need to circle around and get a better understanding of the TAP decision. Additionally, we need to follow up on the FOIA decision. It's difficult to get everyone together in one room. Do understand that the TAP is an administrative (internal) decision.

NO: What about the ethnography?

PG: Many others are also necessary. The Tribes for example.

CG: How is this possible?

PG: Points have been raised that might cause one to think the NPS position (on the TAP) should be modified. But I can't tell you that's where we're at (revisiting the TAP matter), because it's not where we're at.

SS: For summer camp folks, are we relieved of doing an ethnographic study before decisions are made?

TC: There's a suite of ethnographic needs at Isle Royale. Park needs to figure out priorities as they relate to ethnographies, TCPs, etc. Virtually everybody needs something.

PG: Favorable TAP decisions do not grant one any rights. Does being one (a confirmed TAP) change your adverse effect? Probably not.

NO: Let's look at this community, not just one section of it. It's a requirement. But this is an exceptional situation that exists on Isle Royale.

PG: Back to Section 106 (of NHPA), if we had all those ethnographic studies done, this would help us make better decisions. But we don't have them and time marches on. The plan needs to be completed.

CG: If we have disagreements with TAP decision, then how much difference can we make now?

PG: If you feel that we need to revisit this, then we can decide whether or not to reopen the door.

BC: I hear a need to get plan done because we're losing (historic/cultural) resources. Can the plan be written to allow the door to be open to readdress these issues as studies are completed?

TC: Section 110 (of NHPA) calls for this to continue indefinitely.

PG: This is a public resource. You have a chance to help us frame the alternatives. Is this plan (CRMP) a moot point because you don't have everything you want? NEPA processes are always open for new information.

BC: Need to get to point where things are determined (evaluated) for National Register.

MM: We want to pass information forward as much as we can. Our worry is that you'll draft a plan with little interaction.

PG: There are two other points of contact (for open communication). Regarding the TAP discussion, put new info on table. Whatever we do for you in this regard needs to go out to the public. Normally we wouldn't share this until the end. But we'll share all of this for everyone so everyone knows who said what. A second opportunity comes at the point of a draft plan with adverse effects. At this point we will absolutely include everyone.

DS: Additionally we have a Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) for Washington/Barnum Islands that comes with a variety of recommendations. The CLR got to the point where it was introduced to public, who got confused with this in respect to CRMP. We brought it to a stage of development with refined alternatives. We now are at a point where it might inform the plan, but it may need further review. There should be an opportunity for further review and comment to inform the alternatives.

MM: But they (structures on Washington/Barnum islands) are in Non-wilderness. A little different no?

DS: Yes indeed. The contractor stopped work here until CRMP caught up with an acceptable framework. I need to go back and talk to Bill Harlow, find out if it's available for us to revisit, and then send it out to the public. But my point is that this would be an opportunity to introduce new material. We need to know if it's in a state that's ready for review. We need to think about how public this needs to be with regard to review and comment.

TC: We've been at this for three hours. How often and how frequent do we want to talk?

BC: Regarding Section 106, I'm a little nervous because no tribes are here. It is absolutely important that every consulting party knows what's going on. I need to know why they're not here.

LV: We did inform them. They have a busy schedule.

BC: They (the Tribal bands) may be in conflict with IRFFA's proposals.

PG: Our impression is that the Band's retention of their identity and authority is critical. The bands chose not to be part of this meeting.

CG: They get independent consultation?

LV: Yes, they are a sovereign government.

CG: You're paid to do this for years. We don't have opportunities to learn about this (plan-related issues) except by ourselves. We're behind in the learning process and feel uninformed sometimes.

BC: I heard the date December 4<sup>th</sup> thrown out. Does this apply to consulting parties?

PG: That's for the general public. Consulting parties can supply information later, but the closer to the date the better. Comments have more influence when they come sooner rather than later. Regarding alternatives it matters.

DS: I heard Phyllis say that we could push the dates later.

PG: A defined scoping period is necessary for the public. But if date needs to be changed/modified, let us know.

MM: Can we get minutes from tribal consultations?

PG: Yes and no. We'll review the minutes with them and then maybe post to public if OK.

CG: Who do you speak to regarding tribes?

LV/DS: Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) or tribal chairs.

TC: The Grand Portage Band does not have a THPO.

MM: Who else? Are they involved?

LV: It varies by tribe. There are many regional tribes.

TC: Some weigh in more than others. They're wrapped up in many other issues beyond ISRO.

PG: My top priority would be an ethnographic review of tribal entities.

BC: What is the role of ACHP here? I assume they've been contacted.

DS: They have suggested interest but have not formally engaged. Are you encouraging this?

BC: I'm just curious about their role at the moment.

TC: I'm trying to get one definite comment here. What is a good timeframe for consultation?

BC: Who's not involved today?

DS: ACHP and Tribes

MM: Face to face is best.

SS: UMD and St. Scholastica has made available televised conferences.

DH: Consulting parties can contribute whenever but every few months an update or face to face meeting is ideal.

MM: Face to face is best. From my point of view there are some major loose ends that I'm not happy with. There are significant gaps in baseline data, historic significance, how we define terms, etc. Our main point of difference is that plan will move forward, but we feel you are not following policy without baseline data that could affect historic structures.

DS: I disagree with this opinion...that we're going to lose structures without having every iota of information on hand.

MM: But how can you follow certain laws and not others?

CG: A REAP study is to be four months.

TC: The way I would summarize this sort of question follows. We're at 100% of baseline information for structures. Ethnographic is a bit different however. Where do you stop? What about lighthouse keepers? We're at 50% for ethnographic. The discipline we're behind on is Archaeology. And it's the only cultural resource mentioned in the enabling legislation. The point you raise is OK, but there are many other resources that deserve equal attention.

MM: We do feel that because we've been proactive in pushing for this plan, that we have a loud voice. But our voice is not heard. I'm with you, we like CR. It all needs to get done and we need to be creative. But we do feel that in the scheme of things, our voices are not being heard.

CG: I think you presume that all we want is our use to continue in perpetuity. We understand that things should change; most of us at least.

TC: We all agree that Tobin Harbor is a historic district.

MM: But we're worried about the long term track record. These high integrity places exist because we've been here. We've lived up to the obligation to protect these structures.

PG: We have choices and we can regurgitate what we've heard in past. But I feel the more informed you are about the issues involved, the better you stand in continued dialogue. It's difficult to keep everyone on the same page. The charge (that IRFFA's voice is not heard) would be true if I didn't listen to what you have voiced. But it's a two way street (regarding dialogue). It won't work if we keep reviewing the same issues. How one chooses to react to certain content is your choice. But I am the decider here and I have to keep the many things/voices in balance.



DS: There may be things that come up in our process that prompt us to communicate with you.

CG: So Phyllis, you're saying that we're so emotionally involved that we don't hear you sometimes?

PG: Yes, at times I feel we are being heard through filters. But I don't take offence.

SS: My mother's commercial fishing license number was 120. Each year was like a renewal. We (the family) had a license. The activity was assessment fishing, which was authorized by the NPS. My dad and mom had an SUP.

TC: Any final thoughts?

THANK YOUs passed around.

**MEETING ADJOURNS.**